

1
2
3
4
5

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8

9) Case No. 14-cv-00037-SC
10 LESLIE FLOURNEY, et al.,)
11 Plaintiffs,) ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO
12 v.) STAY
13 ORGANON USA, INC., et al.,)
14 Defendants.)
15 _____)

16 Plaintiffs bring this product liability action in connection
17 with NuvaRing, a contraceptive device allegedly manufactured and
18 marketed by Defendants. Plaintiffs initially filed this action in
19 state court, but Defendants removed on diversity grounds, claiming
20 that Defendant McKesson Corporation, a California citizen, was
21 fraudulently joined. Defendants now move to stay this action
22 pending a decision by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict
23 Litigation ("JPML") as to whether the case should be transferred to
24 a multidistrict litigation ("MDL") proceeding established in the
25 Eastern District of Missouri, captioned In Re NuvaRing Products
26 Liability Litigation, MDL 1964. ECF No. 16 ("MTS").¹ Also pending

27 ¹ The motion is fully briefed. ECF Nos. 17 ("Opp'n"), 25
28 ("Reply").

1 before the Court is Plaintiffs' motion to remand. ECF No. 21.
2 Plaintiffs argue that the Court should consider their motion to
3 remand prior to adjudicating Defendants' motion to stay.

4 Out of deference to the MDL process and the uniformity and
5 predictability it promotes, the Court declines to decide
6 Plaintiffs' motion to remand at this time. The NuvaRing MDL is
7 also capable of adjudicating Plaintiffs' motion to remand.
8 Further, as the issues presented in Plaintiffs' motion have been
9 raised in a number of similar cases that may be transferred, the
10 NuvaRing MDL is in the best position to ensure the consistent
11 resolution of those issues. Faced with competing motions to stay
12 and remand, a number of judges in this District have already stayed
13 similar actions pending transfer to the NuvaRing MDL. See, e.g.,
14 ECF No. 16-2 ("Boranian Decl.") Exs. A (Aug. 14, 2013 Order by
15 Judge Alsup in Asche v. Organon, Case No. C 13-4986), B (Dec. 3,
16 2013 Order by Judge Wilken in Buyak v. Organon, Case No. C 13-
17 03128-WHA); Burton v. Organon, Case No. 13-1535, 2013 WL 1963954
18 (N.D. Cal. May 10, 2013) (Judge Hamilton).

19 The Court finds that staying this case is warranted because
20 (1) potential prejudice to Plaintiffs is minimal, given how soon
21 the JPML's decision is likely to issue; (2) not staying the matter
22 could expose Defendants to needless litigation and inconsistent
23 rulings in their pending cases; and (3) not staying the case would
24 waste judicial resources, since these cases may be consolidated in
25 the NuvaRing MDL. See Couture v. Hoffman-La Roche, Inc., No. 12-
26 cv-2657 PJH, 2012 WL 3042994 (N.D. Cal. July 25, 2012) (listing
27 factors to be considered in issuing a stay); see also Landis v. N.
28 Am. Co., 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936) (the court's power to stay cases

1 is inherent in its ability to control disposition of cases on its
2 docket).

3 Accordingly, the Court STAYS this matter pending the JPML's
4 decision on whether the case should be transferred. The parties
5 are ORDERED to file a joint notice with the Court within seven (7)
6 days of the JPML's decision.

7

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9
10 February 21, 2014



11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE